

REMARKS

The present Amendment is in response to the Examiner's Office Action mailed February 19, 2008. Claims 11 and 12 are cancelled and claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 13, 14, 19, 21, and 22 are amended. Claims 1-10 and 13-22 are now pending in view of the above amendments.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references. In addition, Applicants request that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicants understanding and discussion of the references, if any, is consistent with the Examiner's understanding.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

The Examiner rejects claims 14 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The Applicant respectfully traverses the allegation that the elements identified by the Examiner lack written description. Rather, such elements are clearly described and/or shown in the specification and drawings. However, the elements identified by the Examiner have been removed from claims 14 and 22. Therefore, the rejections of 14 and 22 are moot.

II. Allowed Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claim 12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the elements of claim 12 and intervening claim 11. In particular, the scope of claim 1 has not been narrowed in any way from that previously presented as claim 12 so as to overcome any prior art, but has merely been rewritten in an independent format. As acknowledged by the Examiner, that claim is patentably distinct from the prior art, and is now in a condition for allowance.

Claim 9 has also been amended similar to claim 1 and is believed to be allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 1. Moreover, for at least the same reason, claims now depending from claims 1 or 9 – namely, claims 2-8, 10, and 13-22 – are also in a condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe the claims as amended are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 8th day of April, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

/David A. Jones/ Reg. 50,004

DAVID A. JONES

Registration No. 50,004

Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 022913

Telephone: (801) 533-9800

W:\15436\446.1\KJN0000006138V001.doc